

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE of CALIFORNIA
CALIFORNIA CLEAN ENERGY JOBS ACT
CITIZENS OVERSIGHT BOARD

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
ROSENFELD HEARING ROOM - FIRST FLOOR
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

This meeting of the Citizens Oversight Board will
include teleconference participation by one or more
Board Members. Per Government Code section 11123(b)(2),
the teleconference locations, in addition to the address
above, are:

LOS ANGELES CLEANTECH INCUBATOR
525 S. HEWITT STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90065

Thursday, March 22, 2018
1:03 p.m.

Brittany Flores, CSR 13460

1 APPEARANCES

2 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

3 Kate Gordon, Chairwoman

4 Mark Gold, Vice-Chair

5 David Dias

6 Barbara Lloyd

7 Randall Martinez

8 *Chelina Odbert

9 *Heather Rosenberg

10 (* denotes via telephones and/or WebEx)

11
12 CEC STAFF PRESENT

13 James Bartridge

14 Jack Bastida

15 Michael Murza, Law & Policy Advisor to Chair

16 Weisenmiller

INDEX

	Page
1. Introduction and Rollcall	5
2. Approval of Minutes from the February 23rd, 2018 Board Meeting	6
3. Presentation of Design Update of the New School Bus Replacement Program	7
4. Presentation, Discussion, and Possible Vote on Annual Legislative Report of the California Clean Energy Jobs Act	45
5. Public Comment	96
Adjournment	98
Reporter's Certificate	99

1 PROCEEDINGS:

2 March 22, 2018

3
4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Welcome,
5 everybody, to this meeting of the Citizens Oversight
6 Board for the California Clean Energy Jobs Act. I'll
7 turn on my microphone now so that everybody will be
8 happy with me. Sorry.

9 Welcome, again, to this, this meeting of the
10 Citizens Oversight Board of the California Clean Energy
11 Jobs Act. Thrilled to have so many people in person.
12 It's great to have the southern California constituents
13 coming up for this meeting. Thank you, guys. So let's
14 call roll.

15 Jim, you want to do a rollcall.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: I will. Before we do that,
17 let me do the housekeeping items real quick. So if
18 you're not familiar with the building, restrooms, across
19 the hall. Snack bar on the second floor. Am I on?

20 In the event of an emergency, follow employees
21 across the street to the park. We'll reconvene at, at
22 Roosevelt Park if something -- once that's resolved,
23 we'll be back in the building. So that's, that's that
24 side of it, and let me go ahead and call the roll.

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: Board Chair Gordon.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Here.

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark Gold.

3 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Here.

4 MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias.

5 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Here.

6 MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd.

7 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Here.

8 MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez.

9 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Here.

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: And offsite, Chelina Odbert.

11 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: She's going to be
12 here, but she's not here yet.

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: And Heather Rosenberg.

14 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: That's me.

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: What time is Chelina
17 joining? Do we know?

18 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Nope. She was
19 supposed to be here.

20 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Will you just let
21 us know when she gets there? Just give us a shout.

22 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yep.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We have a quorum any
24 way, but I just want to make sure we know when she's
25 here.

1 All right. The first item, as always, is to
2 approve the minutes, which were, hopefully, already
3 reviewed by Member Barbara and I think are now accurate.
4 So can people take a quick look at the minutes from last
5 meeting and make a motion if you would like to approve
6 them.

7 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: So move.

8 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Second.

9 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: All in favor?

10

11 (Simultaneous voice vote.)

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Anyone opposed?

14 Any abstentions? Great.

15 And just to make sure we note that Chelina is not
16 here yet, so it's a vote of however many people that is.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: And I wasn't looking up, but
18 who made the motion?

19 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Mark and Barbara
20 seconded. We're going to get better about that,
21 recording that -- the, the motion -- the motions.

22 So before we go to Item 3, I just want to remind
23 folks that the meeting today is primarily -- well,
24 there's two different pieces of it. Primarily, the vote
25 is to do two things. One is -- those from last week,

1 you were -- last week. Feels like week -- last month,
2 remember that we talked about some of the program
3 changes from SB 110. One of the program changes that,
4 in some ways, is the most significant because we have
5 never dealt with it before is the school bus
6 electrification program, and we're going to talk about
7 that today. And we're, we're going to hear how that's
8 going to work and, and how that program is going to
9 function. And then the other main part of the meeting
10 today is to review and I hope approve our report from
11 this Board to the legislature, which is due at the end
12 of March every year.

13 So this is always a crunch time for this Board.
14 We always have two quick meetings in a row in the
15 spring, and I just wanted to thank everyone again for
16 being here and for putting your time and volunteering
17 energy into this, because we, we all know that it's an
18 extra thing on your plate and just wanted to say we all,
19 everyone, appreciates it. So thank you.

20 All right. We're going to move to Item 3. And I
21 think --

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: We have a Liz Shirakh.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I was going to say,
24 that's not Jennifer Masterson.

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: Jennifer is here with us

1 but --

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I should say to the
3 Board, all of you know Liz from all of the years that
4 she spent on staff working on this project on the K
5 through 12 side, and we are fortunate that she's moved
6 over to work on the school bus program, so we have
7 someone who has deep knowledge of this program working
8 with us.

9 So it's great to see you back, Liz.

10 MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you so much. So I'm Liz
11 Shirakh. I now work with Building Transportation
12 Division, and I'm a supervisor for the unit that will be
13 overseeing the school bus program. Jennifer Masterson
14 is the staff lead for the program, and there's other
15 staff in the audience if I can't answer any question or
16 I get stuck today. So happy to be here to share with
17 you where we are with the school bus program. This is
18 an informational item.

19 Can you hear me okay?

20 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yes.

21 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: This is Heather, I
22 just want to let you know --

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, great. And Heather,
24 you're breaking up, but I think you just said Chelina is
25 there, right?

1 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes.

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Thank you so
3 much.

4 MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. Can you hear me?

5 Okay. So I was saying this is an informational
6 item, and we are really at the program development -- as
7 far as concepts go, we haven't formulated official
8 recommendations on this. So again, this is high level
9 concepts that we're considering right now and getting
10 public feedback.

11 So for today's presentation, I'd like to give you
12 a little bit of background on the legislation, on SB
13 110. Next, talk about the development -- program
14 development concepts and implementation ideas that we're
15 currently considering. And then finally, at the end,
16 I'd like to have, you know, opportunity for you to ask
17 questions if you have additional questions.

18 The primary goals of the program and objective is
19 to implement SB 110, the Clean Energy Job Creation
20 Program that created the school bus replacement program,
21 but we also recognize this provides an opportunity to
22 support the Governor's executive order to boost the
23 supply of zero emission vehicles and zero emission
24 infrastructure in California. And, of course, there are
25 other goals of the program; children's health and

1 safety; equitable distribution of these funding
2 throughout California; building a zero emissions school
3 infrastructure to support future needs; and, of course,
4 reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

5 So SB 110, a trailer bill in -- was passed in
6 July of 2017 and it created three new programs with the
7 remaining funding of the existing Prop 39, K through 12
8 grant program. It states that the first 75 million
9 that's remaining from the program be used for a school
10 bus replacement program. And SB 110 has some specific
11 requirements for the school bus program. First is
12 eligible applicants, and these are school districts,
13 public school districts, and County offices of
14 education. SB 110 also says -- gives us some priority
15 when considering the school buses that we're replacing.
16 We're to look at the oldest school busses or school
17 buses operating in disadvantaged communities and the
18 schools that have the majority of students eligible for
19 the free and reduced price meal from the prior year.
20 Additionally, any school bus that's replaced should be
21 scrapped. In addition to these really specific
22 requirements, the school bus program must also follow
23 many of the rules that apply to the K through 12 grant
24 program, such as the cost effectiveness. The total
25 benefits must be greater than the total project cost

1 over time. Also, annual report to the Citizens
2 Oversight Board. So for example, next year, the
3 Commission's report to the Citizens Oversight Board
4 would include the school bus program. All projects are
5 subject to an audit. Again, an area that relates to the
6 Citizens Oversight Board. And also, many of the
7 requirements, such as no sole source -- those types of
8 requirements from the previous program do follow into
9 the new school bus program.

10 But the legislation does differ slightly in some
11 areas. For example, there are no guidelines required in
12 the school bus program, where guidelines were required
13 in the K through 12 program. And there are no set
14 allocations for each LEA like they were in the
15 competitive -- I mean, in the K through 12 program.
16 This will be more of a competitive program based on
17 criteria such as age of the bus. And the eligible
18 applicants are somewhat different in the original
19 program, K through 12 grant program. Local educational
20 agencies included public schools and County Offices of
21 Education, but they also included charter schools and
22 the State special schools. Those will not -- the
23 charter schools and state special schools are not
24 eligible applicants in the school bus program.

25 So now to talk about the conceptual design of the

1 school bus program. This really can be looked at as
2 three parts, and the first part is the actual
3 replacement of the school buses. We have 75 -- we hope
4 to have 75 million for replacing of the school buses.
5 And this is -- can be -- is in two phases. The first
6 phase will actually be identifying the eligible school
7 buses for replacement and that, most likely, would be in
8 a application from school districts. And the second
9 phase would be solicitation from bus manufacturers to
10 design, construct, and actually deliver the school
11 buses. Again, that would be the 75 million for Prop 39,
12 but we're also proposing two additional components of
13 the program that would be more leveraged funding to Prop
14 39, which would be funding coming from the Energy
15 Commission, Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle
16 Technology Program, and the first part would be
17 infrastructure. So providing an incentive to schools
18 that choose an electric bus, we're proposing that we
19 would complement that by providing infrastructure
20 funding for the charging stations. And third --

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I'm sorry, Liz. Would
22 that funding be from the same --

23 MS. SHIRAKH: That would be from the
24 Alternative and Renewable Fuel and --

25 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Got it.

1 MS. SHIRAKH: -- Vehicle Technology Program.

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thanks.

3 MS. SHIRAKH: Also known as ARFVTP.

4 And with that same funding source, we're
5 proposing a third component, which would be workforce
6 training. This would be training needed for the
7 maintenance and operating of the buses and the charging
8 stations. So that's just, kind of, the overall concept,
9 and now I would like to talk a little bit about the
10 specific school bus part.

11 So we're -- the first phase is to identify where
12 the oldest school buses are and make awards to schools
13 that have the oldest school buses. And once we have a
14 list of eligible buses established, these awards would
15 be made directly to school districts in ranking order
16 until the funds are exhausted. School districts
17 purchase the buses from a bus manufacturer who's already
18 participated in our competitive solicitation.

19 The second phase is the bus solicitation. In
20 this process, the manufacturers would submit a grant
21 application demonstrating the ability to make the --
22 manufacture the school buses. Applicants would describe
23 the types of buses available; number of buses; cost of
24 these buses; maybe some bulk pricing or, or price
25 reduction for, you know, volume; and timing of delivery

1 of these buses. Our goal is to fund bus -- to fund bus
2 manufacturers with the most competitive price, fastest
3 delivery, and most robust customer service package for
4 the buses.

5 Once the bus manufacturers are selected, they'll
6 enter into an agreement with the Energy Commission for
7 the construction of the specific number of buses. And
8 then the school buses -- the school districts will pay
9 manufacturers directly with the Energy Commission's
10 grant funding.

11 So what have we accomplished to date, as I said
12 at the beginning, we're in program development phase,
13 and we have conducted quite a few focus group meetings.
14 We have met with representatives from organizations that
15 have run similar bus program -- incentive programs to
16 gather information in existing programs; obtain lessons
17 learned; identify co-funding opportunities; and seek
18 support and outreach for the program. And we have also
19 reached out to school districts to better understand
20 their needs. We've held three public workshops in
21 February to gather public input and stakeholder input.
22 We have a school bus replacement web page that is linked
23 to the Prop 39 K through 12 grant program web page. And
24 finally, we have established a hotline, a phone number.
25 So if people have questions, they can call the Prop 39

1 hotline, and now there's a specific number for the bus
2 program.

3 During our recent workshops -- as I said, the
4 purpose is to gather public information and -- or public
5 input. And so we asked three major questions. And, you
6 know, how, how do we identify the oldest buses? What
7 makes the most sense? How do we distribute the funding
8 awards, and what type of replacement buses should we
9 allow? We asked the participants to provide written
10 comments to our docket and one -- I just wanted to give
11 you an example of the question. Our first -- or one of
12 our questions -- you know, how should the funds be
13 distributed? This is a sample of what we did at our
14 workshop. We presented two scenarios. This is the
15 first one, where we would distribute the funding evenly
16 in four areas or four regions of California. These were
17 identified or broken up by average daily attendance.
18 Each of these regions is approximately one and a half
19 million students and these four areas, you can see,
20 northern, central, southern, and then we have LA County.
21 The funding -- with this scenario, each of these regions
22 would receive about \$18.75 million, and then we would
23 prioritize the oldest buses in these regions and, and
24 also based on other points, such as some points to
25 disadvantaged communities or, you know, the majority of

1 students that are receiving the free and reduced price
2 meal program, and that's how the funding could be
3 distributed.

4 Another scenario we presented is distributing the
5 funding solely based on the age of the school bus and
6 not necessarily looking at the region or area of
7 California. There is some data available from the
8 California Highway Patrol and the DMV on age of school
9 buses. We also did some phone surveys, reaching out to
10 schools to verify some of this information, but this is
11 what we saw. And as you can see, if we distributed the
12 funding in this scenario, majority of the funding would
13 land in the Central Valley. And in addition, some of
14 the data is dated, and so we would have to do additional
15 work to, kind of, refine and mine that data to be able
16 to identify the oldest buses that are actually still on
17 school districts -- or owned by the school district.

18 Some of the other questions we asked at the
19 workshops, just so you have a flavor for what we did,
20 you know, is there anything missing from our proposed
21 approach? Infrastructure, would they need that type of
22 support and would they be, you know, wanting training
23 and development? So, again, this is just a sample of
24 the many questions that we asked at our workshop.

25 Public comments. We had -- I think the public

1 comment period ended on February twenty --

2 MS. MASTERSON: We extended it.

3 MS. SHIRAKH: Oh, that's right.

4 MS. MASTERSON: So March 7th.

5 MS. SHIRAKH: March 7th was the end of the
6 public comment period, and we received 24 individual
7 letters. And when you break that down, about 55
8 individual comments and quite a few different
9 categories, but this slide shows the top categories that
10 were commented on. You know, again, the geographical
11 distribution, how are we -- how would we distribute
12 those funding; the types of buses that would be
13 replaced; and then how would we rank the buses. So
14 these were some of the comment areas that the public had
15 commented on.

16 Now, I'd like to transition a bit and just talk a
17 little bit about electric school buses and a potential
18 emphasis on electric school buses. While the
19 legislation doesn't specify the type of bus that should
20 be purchased, we're emphasizing the electric school
21 bus -- school buses in this program -- and you probably
22 see that by the added incentives to infrastructure and
23 workforce development training, electric school buses
24 have many benefits. Lower emissions, which benefits
25 children's health. Reduced noise, you know, quieter

1 ride for the children. Quieter neighborhoods around the
2 resident -- for the residents living around school
3 sites, lower maintenance cost, lower fuel cost.

4 Electric school buses are an emerging technology
5 but there are -- let's see. And they have a higher
6 upfront cost than some, you know, mature technologies
7 but there is a lower operating -- annual operating
8 expense and maintenance cost. And electric buses do
9 have the greatest energy savings.

10 Also, just wanted to show a visual of -- although
11 it's an emerging technology, there are quite a few
12 electric school buses available or will be available
13 soon. And this is just a few of the samples that are
14 currently on the road or, like I said, will be in the
15 near future.

16 So also -- let's see. The electric school buses
17 come in a variety of sizes and types and ranges. So
18 that is something that we want to consider because
19 districts have various needs, and we want to be able to
20 make sure that there is some flexibility in their
21 choices, but the technology is developing, and we're
22 seeing more different sizes and larger ranges.

23 Next, I'd just like to touch briefly on the two
24 components I talked about that were in addition to the
25 Prop 39 funding, the infrastructure and workforce

1 training. Infrastructure is the second component and,
2 as I mentioned before, would be funded through another
3 funding source not Prop 39. But we could offer an
4 incentive to school districts that chose electric buses
5 by providing the infrastructure for the electrical
6 view -- charging.

7 And this just shows an example of the variety of
8 charging systems that are available. Again, this is an
9 emerging technology, but the market is growing, and
10 there are options.

11 And finally, workforce development to provide
12 school districts that provide -- that choose an electric
13 bus training for the workforce. Again, that would be
14 funded through the ARFVTP funds, and these would be
15 complementary to the Prop 39 funding.

16 Proposed schedule. Again, we're still in the
17 early stages of program development, and we're still
18 considering the public comments we received at the
19 workshops. This is a tentative schedule that we shared
20 at our workshops, and it's, it's subject to change, but
21 we are considering releasing a solicitation to schools,
22 May or June. That would be -- that solicitation would
23 be an application to identify those oldest school buses,
24 and identify the school districts that are interested in
25 participating in this program.

1 Funding becomes available when the budget is
2 signed July 1st. Then we'll know for sure the remaining
3 balance of that Prop 39 funding. We could then move
4 forward with program awards if we need to go to a
5 Emergency Commission business meeting, and then the bus
6 delivery would be most likely to 2019. We'd need to go
7 through a bus solicitation and secure, secure that. But
8 to give you a -- kind of, a overall, very general
9 possible schedule -- how's that work for lots of
10 qualifiers -- just want to share ways to stay connected
11 to the program. We do have a list serve. It's the Prop
12 39 list serve that we've used for the K through 12
13 program. Jennifer Masterson is the staff lead for the
14 program, and we have a hotline.

15 And I think that was it. I'll stay there. I'd
16 be happy to ask -- or answer any questions you may have.

17 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. I'm sure we have
18 many. I think both people -- everyone has questions.

19 Randall, do you want to start?

20 COMMISSIONER MARTINEZ: Sure.

21 Thank you very much for the information and the
22 presentation. I appreciate the list of potential
23 manufacturers, and that caught my attention. Based on
24 what research you have done so far, are any of these
25 manufacturers headquartered in California,

1 California-based companies?

2 MS. SHIRAKH: I will have to rely on some
3 staff here.

4 MS. WILLIAMS: Hi. My name is Sara
5 Williams. My understanding is that none of the bus
6 manufacturers are headquartered in California.
7 Bloomberg is one option that is America -- in the United
8 States of America.

9 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Uh-huh.

10 MS. WILLIAMS: But the rest of them are not
11 I believe. There are component manufacturers in
12 California, and there are transit bus manufacturers in
13 California but not school bus.

14 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Okay. And the
15 reason I ask that question -- and I appreciate that
16 answer. Thank you -- is that these companies are going
17 to benefit from a fairly lucrative contract. When
18 they're not based in California, they don't pay State
19 taxes on their corporate profits, and that's a shame
20 especially since the taxpayers in California are funding
21 this particular program.

22 So I would encourage your -- you and staff to
23 think about ways you could either identify or cultivate
24 California based manufacturers if they exist. And if
25 not, maybe come up with solutions and creative ways to

1 encourage out-of-state contractors to somehow maximize
2 their California footprint.

3 Second idea is these out-of-state manufacturers
4 probably have little knowledge, if any, of what else the
5 Proposition 39 has accomplished besides enabling them to
6 make some school buses, manufacture school buses. And I
7 would encourage you in your solicitation to identify the
8 manufacturers, to encourage the successful manufacturer
9 to come up with a plan to incorporate other aspects of
10 Prop 39 into their manufacture. Perhaps, recruiting
11 potential employees from the community colleges that
12 actually put together curriculum and graduated students.
13 They could partner with these community colleges and set
14 forth a plan that, that is acceptable to staff. And
15 they could also work with the workforce development
16 folks to potentially identify some of the graduates from
17 our Conservation Corps programs that might be eligible
18 to work on the manufacturing of such, such buses if
19 they're going to be manufactured here in the state
20 locally.

21 MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. Thank you for your
22 comment.

23 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Thank you.

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can just -- Sarah, can
25 you just clarify. Were you saying that there are no

1 school bus manufactures in California at this time?

2 MS. WILLIAMS: To the best of my knowledge,
3 at this time, that is correct specifically because we're
4 also not looking at diesel school bus manufacturers.
5 We're looking at electric and potentially other
6 alternative fuels.

7 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Thank you. That
8 was a great question, though, Randall. Thank you.
9 Mark.

10 I'm holding my own many questions here.

11 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: So I have got a few, so
12 bear with me. They're going to, sort of, jump around
13 and not all be thematic, but, but they are about buses.
14 But, but -- so the first one is for a criteria that
15 wasn't included that I think would be critical in light
16 of the priority of children's health and safety -- would
17 be that not only in disadvantaged communities but in
18 non-attainment areas from the standpoint of meeting air
19 quality standards, and is that something that can just
20 be added? Or is there a rationale for why that wasn't
21 an original criteria? It seems, sort of, like an
22 obvious one.

23 MS. SHIRAKH: Well, the criteria that I have
24 mentioned for the disadvantaged community and the free
25 and reduced price meals is specific in the legislation.

1 So those are, are ones that legislation suggests that
2 we -- and it's, kind of, an "or" thing. So --

3 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Right.

4 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And is it an "or" or an
5 "and"? That's actually a question.

6 MS. SHIRAKH: It -- that's a good question.

7 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: But for me, the air
8 quality component is really important.

9 MS. SHIRAKH: Yeah. I hear what you're
10 saying.

11 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. And so, so
12 non-attainment. And the other thing is if it's not --
13 and I hope that's -- I hope you have the flexibility to
14 add that as criteria because it would strengthen this
15 program dramatically -- but what it also opens up is you
16 talked extensively about electric, but if you're in an
17 attainment area, as an example, you might look at
18 renewable gas buses on -- you know, is -- they're
19 cheaper capital costs on -- and, you know, they do
20 have -- they're, they're great on greenhouse gas
21 emissions. But the issue is from a public health
22 perspective, you know, there's still going to be -- even
23 with the latest engines that are out there, there's
24 still going to be, obviously, worse than electric bus,
25 which is zero emissions.

1 So that part, I feel like we don't really have
2 the information there. Do you have -- so shifting gears
3 a little bit -- on the cost savings of electric buses,
4 you give us maintenance, fuel, but you don't give us the
5 capital cost of the bus itself. So is there a ballpark
6 estimate of an electric bus versus, for example, a
7 natural gas bus with, with near zero emission engine?

8 MS. SHIRAKH: So I, I might have to have
9 Sarah -- my understanding is the electric bus is, like,
10 three to four hundred but I'm going to let Sarah --

11 MS. WILLIAMS: I think that I would --
12 sorry. I think that I would agree with Liz. About 350,
13 it would be a electric bus. And if memory serves -- and
14 I don't have this right in front of me -- a natural gas
15 bus, you're looking at about a hundred and sixty
16 thousand.

17 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: But is that even with
18 the -- because the new engines aren't going to last two,
19 three years on natural gas.

20 MS. WILLIAMS: Those probably are going to
21 be a higher cost, but I don't know that I have a number
22 for that.

23 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Okay. So I think that
24 would be useful, useful to know. And then --

25 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can you hold on that one

1 for one second just because it is related.

2 Can you talk for a second about the -- you said
3 this briefly, but it's very related to Mark's point. So
4 you're not using a savings investment ratio as we have
5 in the prior program, but you are using a benefits
6 greater than the total cost over time. Can you just
7 talk about what that means; how, how you're look at
8 that, sort of, capital cost savings over time; what's
9 included in that.

10 MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. What I mentioned was
11 that the requirement in the statute -- the -- which is
12 cost effectiveness, which is that the benefits need to
13 be greater than the cost over time. That is the same
14 requirement of the current program. The current program
15 then developed what we call the savings to investment
16 ratio, which was a formula to determine the cost
17 effectiveness of the energy efficiency project. We're
18 exploring doing a similar, if you want to say, you know,
19 savings to investment ratio for a bus. So -- because
20 that is the requirement of the statute that we showed
21 these buses are cost effective. So I don't have that
22 exact formula. It's still under development, but it is
23 a requirement of the program.

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Go ahead, Mark.

25 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Okay. So, so the last two

1 are just, sort of, points, which is, you know, if you
2 are looking at renewable gas buses as a viable option,
3 the one thing I would encourage you to do is ensure that
4 the renewable gas is from California, where it's not
5 right now. And so that would be an opportunity to, sort
6 of, you know, force that market a little bit to occur,
7 which has been a big issue, you know, having, having the
8 gas come from landfills and -- in the south doesn't
9 really make much sense.

10 And then the last thing is on -- and the reason
11 that looks really familiar is I literally just spent --
12 had an hour on this exact issue with the big blue bus
13 fleet in the City of Santa Monica. So that's why it's
14 all really familiar in my head. I, normally, don't know
15 anything about buses. But the thing that -- the thing
16 that they're going to end up doing a pilot on is that
17 there's, sort of, the manufacturers' range versus
18 reality. And they have been seeing on manufacturers'
19 range versus reality -- it's, like, 50 percent. So it's
20 something that you guys should really take a hard look
21 at. Like, you want to -- you want demonstrated range as
22 opposed to manufactured range on electric bus. Believe
23 me, I'd like nothing better than, especially in
24 non-attainment areas, to go to full electric buses. But
25 just make sure you're not -- you're not purchasing buses

1 that say they're going to go a hundred and fifty miles,
2 and then they only go 75. And that's really been a big
3 problem on, on the bus fleets. So --

4 MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you.

5 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That's a really good
6 point, and I'm, I'm actually already thinking that we
7 may -- what we may do, as a Board, is decide to write a
8 letter to the CEC with some of these recommendations so
9 that we have them in a more formal way.

10 MS. SHIRAKH: Okay.

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just to let you know
12 what's in my head, and we should all be thinking about
13 that.

14 Dave, you had a question and then I'm sure
15 Barbara does and then we'll go to the phone.

16 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah. Actually, that
17 was a good point. I have a plug-in electric Ford
18 Fusion, and it doesn't get quite the milage it says for
19 the plug-in. Of the electric plug-in, the range isn't
20 quite there yet. So anyhow -- so I'm glad you brought
21 that point up.

22 Charging stations or infrastructure. Okay.
23 Well, if you don't put the charging station in, the
24 electric bus really doesn't do you any good unless you
25 have a really long cord. So I think that's, you know,

1 critical. But not only that -- okay. So if -- say a
2 school district, or whatever, gets two buses, or
3 whatever, to start out with. I think when you do the
4 infrastructure, when the infrastructure is done, it
5 should be more charging stations than actually needed to
6 begin with because it's going to cost a lot more to just
7 come back every time and add a station than if you put
8 more in possibly needed to begin with because
9 bringing -- I'm in construction, so I know. Bringing
10 back more and more and more adds to the cost. And I
11 don't -- there's some -- probably a rule at how much you
12 can do. But I'd like to see, if we're going to do this
13 or whatever to -- you need to -- or you need to have two
14 buses -- I don't know what the number is. But just in
15 case you add more buses, it's there and maybe even some
16 kind of a solar charging station as well. I don't know
17 if that's out there yet or not. And --

18 MS. SHIRAKH: Those are great points that we
19 have, have, you know, a lot of discussions on those --
20 what the infrastructure would look like and how, how to
21 position that for future.

22 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: And the only other
23 things, actually, that I really had were already brought
24 up. So -- about being built in California or at least
25 the United States and I know that the range is not what

1 they probably state. So that's pretty much it right
2 now.

3 MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Really quickly,
5 following up on that. When -- on the charging, is it
6 right to assume that many of these districts have some
7 centralized station where the buses hang out? I mean,
8 the thing with school buses is they hang out all day
9 when they're not being used in the morning and in the
10 afternoon. So that must be to -- potentially
11 centralize-able. Right?

12 MS. SHIRAKH: That's my understanding.
13 Yeah. And I think -- just to clarify, although, it
14 might be obvious to you. You had said, you know, you
15 need to -- if you have an electric bus, you need to
16 charge it somehow. So our vision is that once we have
17 the -- you know, identify the schools that qualify for
18 buses and we have the bus manufacturer solicitation
19 complete, and they're working on it; then we can work on
20 that infrastructure development before those buses are
21 delivered. So, kind of, timing all that so that you
22 don't end up with a bus and nowhere to charge it.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great.

24 Barbara, I'm sure you have questions.

25 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right. Just a few. So

1 the first one had to do with what kind of feedback you
2 received from the public regarding your scenario one,
3 scenario two. You know, scenario one with some sort of
4 a geographic, you know, pre-allocation formula and
5 scenario two being based on age of buses without direct
6 regard for geographic, you know, equity.

7 MS. SHIRAKH: Yeah. I'm -- I think it was
8 regional, correct? Yeah. I think the regional
9 approach, where it's -- the funding is more distributed
10 equally throughout California, we had more comments
11 favoring that approach.

12 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: In favor of that. I
13 will observe without really taking a, a strong view on
14 it that, that wasn't in the statute, right? The
15 geographic --

16 MS. SHIRAKH: That is --

17 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- wasn't a criteria.
18 And what we have here is a very complicated balancing
19 act of age versus disadvantage versus, maybe, you know,
20 area attainment. And also, there's the potential for,
21 for significant dilution of benefits if each geographic
22 bucket is exactly the same. And one of the reasons
23 that's incredibly obvious to me is looking at the
24 scenario two map, where it looks like SQAMB has already
25 done a lot of work potentially incentivize-ing those

1 fleets to be cleaner, because there's a bigger
2 percentage in California that have, essentially, made
3 that transition. And so maybe fewer buses remain there.
4 Anyway, it's just something to take a look at. I'm not
5 sure that you'll get as much bang for your buck with
6 that equal distribution geographically.

7 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just on that point, it'd
8 actually be worth -- and I don't know if this is easy or
9 hard to do. But it would be interesting to look at the
10 overlap between the non-attainment areas and older buses
11 because I'm just looking at -- eyeballing your map. My
12 sense is you have -- actually have a pretty big overlap
13 with the non-attainment areas down in the Inland Empire
14 on that -- on that -- on that older bus map. Not
15 particularly good overlap on the geographic
16 distribution. So just something to think about as an
17 additional -- just a -- it's an overall goal of
18 California and that's an issue.

19 MS. SHIRAKH: Thank you so much.

20 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And then I had a
21 question. Let's see if I start it -- let me see if I
22 can find the page. Sorry. The two additional funding
23 sources -- one for infrastructure and one for workforce
24 training development -- would seem, to me, to be --
25 essential for districts to know whether or not those

1 resources would be there before they would apply,
2 because if they apply for the funding and those other
3 resources aren't there, they're stuck needing to fund
4 those activities in some other way. How, how is that
5 going to work?

6 MS. SHIRAKH: We would have that identified
7 in the application for the school districts that this,
8 this would come -- you know, if you choose an electric
9 school bus, it comes with these incentives. So it's
10 actual incentives to make that choice.

11 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. So what is --
12 and maybe this is something you can talk to now or maybe
13 we have to hear about it later -- is adding the process
14 for the CEC to formalize those allegations and, and what
15 the ability for CEC to do that in advance of knowing who
16 those -- you know, you almost need a programmatic
17 allocation from the CEC in advance of knowing where the
18 Prop 39 funding would go. Otherwise, it's just a
19 promise that doesn't have any teeth.

20 MS. SHIRAKH: I believe that they -- we --
21 I'm a little new to the fuel and transportation office.

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

23 MS. SHIRAKH: So excuse me for not being
24 able to answer all your questions.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: Let me jump in on that.

2 So the Alternative and Renewable Fuels and
3 Vehicle Technology Program prepares a funding plan every
4 year. There are already components of it for workforce
5 or, or -- charging infrastructure. They do a lot of
6 charging infrastructure throughout the state. I think
7 at last count, it was about 10,000 or 11,000 they funded
8 around the state. So I would see that as -- for this,
9 as a subset of what they already do as a category by
10 line and then they also do as part of that planned
11 workforce training.

12 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So my question then is
13 what is the process by which there's going to be an
14 adequate reservation of funding from those two programs
15 to meet the needs of the district who receives the
16 school bus replacement funding?

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: Right. So --

18 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Did they need to align
19 or else somebody's going to get an award here and
20 there's not going to be enough funding for them, and
21 there's going to be a lot of gnashing of teeth or
22 something?

23 MS. MASTERSON: So there's already been a
24 set aside for this program.

25 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Thank you.

1 MS. MASTERSON: And then, also, we are
2 looking into cost sharing with some of the utilities,
3 because they're coming out with their program for
4 infrastructure as well.

5 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. Just to spread
6 it that much further. Thank you. I did not understand
7 that there had already been a set aside. It seemed a
8 little bit more like wishful thinking. So thank you.

9 And then my only other concern is looking at the
10 proposed schedule, it's unclear what the application
11 submittal time frame would be in the schedule. So
12 there's going to be a solicitation release. Business
13 meetings in August. If the release is May or June means
14 that the districts are having to submit their
15 applications in July. Is that really going to work? I
16 mean, that's -- that may not be enough timing. I don't
17 know.

18 MS. SHIRAKH: That's one of the things that
19 we're considering; why I qualified this tentative
20 schedule because I think we need to have two weeks --
21 two-month window for schools to respond to this
22 application. We want this to be a successful program
23 and we want it to have time and we need to do outreach
24 as well to make sure the schools are aware of this
25 program. July is, kind of, a, a downtime for schools.

1 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah.

2 MS. SHIRAKH: They're on vacation. So our
3 window is pretty much May to June. And if that doesn't
4 seem realistic or doable, then I think we'll have to
5 shift it and come back to the schools in August,
6 September. So again, we're conceptually working out the
7 different possibilities and making recommendations.

8 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

9 MS. SHIRAKH: But those are very good points
10 that we have to have a large enough window so we'll get
11 response and, you know, schools are on schedule.

12 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. And, and really
13 that those who, maybe, have less robust administrative
14 infrastructure are not disadvantaged in the process.

15 MS. SHIRAKH: It is a challenge. We have --
16 what -- 10,000 public school districts. With the Prop
17 39 K through 12 program, we had the luxury of four years
18 to get the word out, and that was difficult at some
19 times for those small, small school districts.

20 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Great. I'm good.

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I want to see if Heather
22 or Chelina have questions.

23 MS. ODBERT: This is Chelina. Can you guys
24 hear us?

25 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yep.

1 MS. ODBERT: Okay. Most of my questions
2 have already been brought up by the rest of you, but
3 maybe just a clarification as to the scenario one versus
4 scenario two. How is that decision going to ultimately
5 be made?

6 MS. SHIRAKH: Well, staff will make a
7 recommendation, and that's a policy call from our
8 Commissioner. So that's the process here. So we are
9 still formulating recommendations, and Commissioner Scot
10 is overseeing the transportation. So it will be a
11 policy call.

12 MS. ODBERT: Okay. Great. I think the
13 other ones were around schedule, and I think they were
14 just asked in the last set of questions. So that's all
15 for me.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Heather? Sorry.
17 Heather, do you have questions?

18 MS. ROSENBERG: No. They have all been
19 answered.

20 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Some really good
21 points have been brought up. I had a question about the
22 workforce training piece. I think all my other
23 questions were answered, which is great.

24 So it's great that you're thinking about
25 workforce training. Can you talk a little bit about

1 what kinds of training you're thinking when you say
2 that.

3 One of the things we know from the Prop 39
4 program is that the multicraft training has been really
5 effective because it is multicraft. It's not just
6 training for one specific, small area that may or may
7 not have jobs in existence. It's training for a variety
8 of things, among which efficiency is one.

9 What kind -- what are you thinking here? Are you
10 thinking on the manufacturing side? Are you thinking
11 drivers? What, what are you -- what's, what's the
12 workforce training theory?

13 MS. SHIRAKH: My thought was that this is
14 more for workforce -- this is training for the schools
15 so they can maintain these buses and operate these buses
16 safely and maintain the charging systems. So --

17 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's really not new
18 jobs. It's really -- it's really, sort of, upscaling
19 operations people that are already in the system.

20 MS. SHIRAKH: I would say that's correct.

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. That's really
22 helpful to understand because it goes to Randall's
23 point, too, about, about whether you can leverage some
24 of the existing workforce pieces of Prop 39, which may
25 or may not be possible because those were mostly

1 building-focused and efficiency-focused and necessarily
2 a different set of skills.

3 I do want to make sure that we're not -- all of
4 us, together, are not overpromising on job creation here
5 because what I'm really hearing is this is not -- I
6 mean, there's not a place in California on the
7 manufacturer's side. The drivers will probably be the
8 same drivers, and we'll probably see custodial staff or
9 existing staff getting additional training to do
10 maintenance. But I'm not hearing a lot of new job
11 creation, so we just need to all be careful about not
12 promising that, because we have been burned by that in
13 the past.

14 Go ahead, Dave.

15 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Do you have any idea how
16 many buses are out there right now?

17 MS. SHIRAKH: Oh. Jennifer -- oh. No.

18 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Well, because I --

19 MS. SHIRAKH: I think that's part of that
20 scenario two, where it has the buses identified -- is
21 that the CHP has -- I believe they have some kind of
22 licensing -- or not licensing --

23 MS. MASTERSON: Certification.

24 MS. SHIRAKH: Certification, that's the
25 right word. Thank you. DMV also has the list. So

1 we've got both those lists. We tried to align them and
2 found a lot of data that was questionable. At that
3 point, we went to the phones and tried to call school
4 districts to verify what's really there. And we found
5 that the information we had was dated. So it would
6 probably be a big lift for the Energy Commission to
7 actually identify and find and know that number.

8 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Well, the reason I was
9 getting at it, I did -- real quick -- the math. And
10 \$350,000 for a school bus, yeah, you're a little over
11 200 for 75 million. And how many school districts are
12 there?

13 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: 11,000, something like
14 that.

15 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: 11,000. That's a drop
16 in the bucket. Yeah. So that's why I was wondering.
17 It's going -- even if you really make a big dent, it's
18 going to take a while.

19 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And this goes back to
20 the prioritization question that we have all been
21 focused on is how do you get the most bang for the buck,
22 given the goals in the program, which our oldest buses,
23 disadvantaged districts. And how to really -- we had
24 the same problem at the beginning of this Prop 39
25 program. As you all remember, there's no inventory of

1 school buildings either. So we also have been -- had a
2 hard time targeting funding, and when, ultimately, the
3 geographic distribution, the Governor's office and
4 legislature did, which was, you know, good and bad.

5 So I, I -- I'm just trying to think through --
6 and we don't have our lawyer here. But I'm trying to
7 think through logistics. It seems to me that we should
8 put together some of these recommendations on paper to
9 Commissioner Scot, it sounds like, is the right
10 recipient of that. I don't think we can do that, as a
11 Board, without an additional meeting and voting. So
12 what we can do, though, is that I and Vice-Chair Gold
13 can write -- the two of us can write a letter,
14 essentially, without an additional meeting, without an
15 additional vote to, to the commissioner seeking info.

16 Is everybody comfortable with that approach?

17 Great. And then we can put some of these
18 recommendations on paper including if we have a
19 recommendation on your scenarios. I think we will --
20 we'll include that because it sounds like we might. So
21 does that sound like a good plan for folks? And let's
22 try to work -- try to do that quickly.

23 Are you good with that, Mark?

24 VICE-CHAIR Gold: Uh-huh.

25 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We'll try to do that

1 quickly.

2 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Do we need a vote
3 asking you guys to do that?

4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I don't think so,
5 because I think if it becomes an official action of the
6 Board, then it has to be everyone in the Board. And
7 then we have to have a meeting about it, and it'd have
8 to be out for public comment. So I think what we'll do
9 is I will -- two of us can communicate something and
10 we'll just informally -- I'll reach out to folks. Does
11 that make sense? I'll double-check with our lawyer that
12 that's okay, but that's my sense as to how this can
13 work.

14 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I'm certainly
15 comfortable. The input I've already given are the
16 questions I already asked.

17 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you. Yeah. We
18 will include all the -- I have written down notes on all
19 the info.

20 Does that sound -- and we'll get something
21 together as quickly as possible so you can include it in
22 your deliberations on the program. Thank you for giving
23 us your overview.

24 MS. SHIRAKH: Okay. Well, thank you so much
25 for having us today.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Absolutely. We're
2 really happy to learn more about this program. As, as
3 folks know, this is the newest -- for us, it's new, too.
4 So we're in the same boat as you. We also are new to
5 this as part of the -- the Prop 39 program. It's a
6 new -- Commissioner Scot hasn't been involved before.
7 So it's a new commissioner, a new set of statutes, a new
8 set of guidelines, a new set of technologies. So I'm
9 happy that we're able to weigh, weigh in early.

10 And right now, this is a reminder, this is
11 one-time allocation. So it may or may not -- again,
12 like everything else, it may or may not get
13 re-appropriated and that will partly depend on how
14 successful the program is. So it's in everybody's
15 interest to make that 75 go as far as possible. So that
16 if it's a successful program, it can be -- there's more
17 money that can be appropriated there.

18 All right.

19 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: You know, actually, on
20 that front --

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah.

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If I may, there's
23 probably some value in collecting the information on the
24 next available chunks of districts and buses in your
25 program so that you could basically say, "Here's where

1 our first 75 million would go. If we had another 75
2 million, here's where it would go," and almost, frankly,
3 pre-ranking them because then those districts go to
4 their legislators and their legislators say, "Okay.
5 We'll try and get the funding." And it's all very
6 symbiotic.

7 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That's a great point,
8 and it's also a good reminder that our report to the
9 legislature next year will include this program, and
10 that's another place for that kind of recommendation.
11 So the more we know from the districts of what is
12 actually working and what their needs are, then the more
13 that we can be -- use that report to make a case for it.

14 MS. SHIRAKH: Absolutely.

15 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. And reminder --
16 one more reminder to this Board is that with, as in
17 everything else, we will be responsible for auditing
18 this program and for paying attention to what the
19 savings actually look like and to making sure it's
20 working. So we -- it is in our interest to be there at
21 the beginning with recommendations and to pay attention
22 throughout the year. This will be added to our audit,
23 not for this current year, but for the following year.
24 And I'm not going to start that discussion now, but that
25 is something we need to talk about, because that's going

1 to be an additional scope. Exactly. We need to figure
2 that out. So that should be in the back of everyone's
3 minds.

4 Thank you so much, Liz. Thank you, everybody.
5 Sara. You guys have been great. Jennifer, great to
6 meet you.

7 All right. Moving to Item 4. This is a
8 presentation and discussion of our annual report to the
9 legislature. I just want to make a couple of remarks on
10 this before we start, particularly, because we have some
11 new folks. Obviously, Barbara and Heather, new to the
12 report process. Mark hasn't gone through a report
13 process yet either. Right?

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: Chair, Chair, can I jump in
15 for one second, please.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, sure.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: As you all know, Chair
18 Weisenmiller is an ex officio member of the Board, and
19 I'd just like to recognize Michael Murza is representing
20 his office, attending today.

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thanks. Sorry, Michael.
22 I should have said that earlier. We're just so used to
23 having you with us. Thank you for being here.

24 Thanks, Jim.

25 So -- you did go through it last year. In any

1 case, reminder to everyone a couple of things about this
2 report. One is the Citizens Oversight Board has two
3 major responsibilities. One is our annual report to the
4 legislature due 90 days after the 1st of the year. So
5 that is always on March 30th except in leap years, which
6 we experienced once, where we had to do it faster. And
7 it is -- the other one of our major responsibilities is
8 the audit, and I just want to be clear that the report
9 to legislature is not the audit. So we are -- we have
10 an entire audit process, in which we have to really dig
11 in on whether these numbers are what they should be and
12 whether what the savings are being reported are what
13 they should be.

14 This report is much more of a programmatic
15 overview and our recommendations based on our unique
16 role of being at the center of all the agencies working
17 on this project, looking at what's working, what our
18 recommendations are, and, and what things are going
19 forward. So I just wanted to be clear on that because
20 some -- in the last couple years, we have gotten into
21 audit-like conversations during this meeting, and I just
22 want to make sure those two things are separate.

23 One thing that's different this year than usual
24 is that, obviously, there are some program changes
25 coming up. This program does not cover any of the

1 program changes. We are not reviewing a year in which
2 there were program changes just to be clear, but we do
3 preview the program changes under SB 110 in this report
4 because we're -- though we're reporting on last year,
5 we're reporting to a legislature that is currently
6 considering potential allocations of money to the new
7 program. So I hope that makes sense. We're reporting
8 on what's happened. But the legislature we're reporting
9 to has the opportunity to give -- to allocate or not
10 allocate funds to this program going forward. So it's
11 different in that way, and those were the two big points
12 I wanted to make.

13 I think what we're going to do is go -- oh, I
14 guess the final point is the one I make every year,
15 which is my annual apology of how last minute this
16 always is. As you know, we get the reports from all the
17 agencies at the, kind of, end of February. We have to
18 have the meeting to review them, approve them, and then
19 write this report and summarize them and then approve
20 this report. It's a very, very fast turnaround, and I
21 just want to thank both Jim and Jack for all of their
22 work over the last month, writing this and pulling
23 pieces together and, and making it easy for the rest of
24 us. So thank you.

25 With all that said, I think what we're going to

1 do is go -- we're going to actually put this up on the
2 screen. I know it's a Word document. It's not ideal,
3 but we may be making some edits. We can make a motion
4 at the end of this meeting, where we incorporate the
5 edits that have been made. So it's -- that's how we're
6 going to try to do this. If we have edits, we're going
7 to try to make it in real time using track changes so
8 they're obvious. And then we will decide on how to
9 incorporate them and whether to incorporate them at the
10 end of the meeting.

11 So any overarching questions about process or
12 about this from the Board before we start?

13 All right. I'm going to have Jim go through,
14 section by section, explaining the outline, sort of,
15 organization of this report, which is slightly
16 different. It's shorter than previous years. I hope
17 everyone appreciates that, and then we're going to dig
18 into a couple sections.

19 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Very good. And yes,
20 it was a fast process. So I apologize for getting the
21 report out to you guys so late, but we're making changes
22 right down to the wire, and we understand there is an
23 opportunity to continue making changes over the next
24 week and still make our legislative deadline. So for
25 those of you that have looked at it, feel free to look

1 at it more. Send us comments in the next couple days,
2 and, and we'll keep -- continue to integrate those as we
3 move forward plus whatever we do today. So we really
4 did try and take a look at this report over the last
5 several years. We incorporated a lot more data that was
6 provided by the outside agencies. And so here, we just
7 tried to preview some of that data and let those reports
8 speak for themselves. So the -- chapter one, we really
9 tried to do a high level look at, at the program overall
10 and what's, what's occurred and the kind of funding
11 that's happened over the last four years and talking
12 about final project completion reports at K through 12,
13 summary of the community college final completion
14 reports. We identified these 2018 program changes in
15 relation to SB 110 that we talked about last time, and
16 we put some comparison tables there in, in the back.
17 They're probably not perfect, but the idea is this has
18 extended. The program has extended, and depending on
19 future legislative allocations that the Board will have
20 some continuing oversight duty into the years ahead. So
21 that -- that's really chapter one.

22 Chapter two is where we talk about what the
23 Citizens Oversight Board mandates, history, and audit
24 progress is; what we do; what we're required to do as
25 part of this report. So it's not a super long chapter,

1 but it does capture the work that we're intending to do
2 or that we're required to do.

3 Just walking through the first chapter of high
4 level -- go to right page here. Sorry.

5 These, these are comparison timelines, where they
6 talked about the current program and the future program.

7 So then here we talked about -- again, here's
8 what we're required to do as part of the Citizens
9 Oversight Board; review the expenditures from the fund,
10 review the annual independent audit. Chair Board talked
11 about that we're not doing that today, but, you know, we
12 have last year's audit, and we have some things to work
13 through still. Publish a complete accounting of all
14 expenditures each year, and then submit an evaluation,
15 changes needed to the program that, that the Board sees
16 fit to do. So here, last year is. Your, your meeting
17 history is included; what we have done so far this year;
18 and again, we, we recognize there's some line edits
19 still needed. We can work through some of those as
20 well.

21 And then we really tried to, in chapter three,
22 give the highest level summary type information of
23 what's going on in the program based on the program
24 reports and then let those reports speak for themselves.
25 And, and of course, we put those revised reports up for

1 you last night as well so that you have them. If you
2 have questions, we can go back to those reports as
3 necessary and work our way through it.

4 And then finally, I think this is an important
5 point of the, the participation by county. We spent
6 some time on this, and pretty much every county except
7 for Alpine is represented, has been touched by Prop 39
8 dollars. And, and I think that's an important point to
9 make. Some more than others but some counties, a
10 hundred percent. A lot of counties, 70 to 99 percent.
11 A lot of counties over 40 percent. So there's a lot of
12 things, positive things, going on out there as a result
13 of this program, and I think that's an important point.
14 And, and this table came from the, the -- or this graph
15 came from the Prop 39 Energy Commission Report.

16 And then finally -- and then another one here is
17 on community colleges, where it shows a lot of projects
18 at community colleges. And I understand that a
19 representative of community colleges is on the line to
20 answer any questions you may have in relation to some of
21 those projects; walk through some of the technical
22 assistance grants and where those dollars have gone; and
23 how that's resulted in changes in the program.

24 And finally -- as we get to it -- here's the job
25 creation side of things you heard about from the

1 Workforce Development Board last time as well. So
2 there's, there's actually been some, some good stuff
3 going on out there. But we're looking at, you know,
4 direct, indirect induced jobs at 18,500. Those are
5 the -- those are the numbers that have been estimated
6 as, as created through this program. And I think that's
7 an important point to get across.

8 And then finally, we get to the recommendations.

9 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Let's hold on
10 that for a second. I want to give people a chance.
11 Barbara, I will start with you, because I know you have
12 some questions. But give people a chance to ask
13 questions for the sections that are not the
14 recommendations section. So we're going to get to that
15 in a minute, but questions or comments or edits on the
16 report, overview section, summary sections, anything up
17 until this, this point? And I -- and I should say at
18 the outset, for Barbara, I know sent some really -- some
19 good copy editing and other people have sent some copy
20 edits. I, I just want to assume you will incorporate
21 all copy edits --

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: We will.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: -- and not get into that
24 here and get into substantive questions.

25 But, Barbara, I'm going to start with you.

1 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So my first substantive
2 question appears on page 16. It's in Table 3-1. Just
3 wanting to make sure that I understand and that the
4 numbers are, in fact, correct. There's an interesting
5 simultaneous number. So disadvantaged LEAs, a total of
6 1,374. Looks like it happens to be the same number as
7 the total number of LEAs participating in our program,
8 which is an interesting irony. And so is it accurate or
9 has -- you know, has something been put in the wrong
10 place?

11 MR. BARTRIDGE: And I'll say, as are the
12 percentages.

13 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes. Well --

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: I, I --

15 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And don't -- they all
16 round to 63 percent.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: Exactly.

18 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: But it was just -- are
19 we right?

20 MR. BARTRIDGE: We have Haile Bucaneg --

21 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Thanks.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: -- from the program here to
23 respond to your concerns.

24 MR. BUCANEG: Good afternoon. Yes, my name
25 is Haile Bucaneg, and we also have Jim here, who put

1 together the report, Jim Holland. So a lot of Jims
2 around.

3 But yeah, we did go back and take a look at the
4 numbers. The 1374 was a bit of a coincidence but it
5 isn't that -- like you mentioned, it isn't that one
6 thousand three -- all disadvantaged schools applied at
7 the time. It's just at that date of June 30th, we
8 happened to have the same number of applicants as the
9 same number of disadvantaged LEAs. And since then, our
10 number has gone up. We're about 1700 now. So --

11 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Total applicants.

12 MR. BUCANEG: Yes.

13 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I mean, total
14 participants.

15 MR. BUCANEG: Total applicants.

16 BOARD MEMBERS LLOYD: So the one thing I
17 would say -- and this, kind of, rises to the level of a
18 line item but not exactly. In that last sentence,
19 before the chart, where we say 63 percent of which
20 participated in the program, since it's not clear what
21 we're talking about there, I would say 63 of both
22 disadvantaged LEAs and remaining LEAs participate in the
23 program. That makes it clear that that 63 percent
24 number, you know, applies to both because otherwise
25 it -- I mean, obviously, once you look to the table,

1 you, sort of, see that, but I just think that would help
2 make clear that this isn't an accident. This is
3 actually what we intended to say.

4 MR. BARTRIDGE: And if I could ask, I do
5 have it on track changes. If you just say that again
6 slowly, I'll --

7 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh, sure. So replace
8 "which" with "both disadvantaged LEAs and remaining
9 LEAs."

10 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's not showing "all
11 mark up." Sorry. You have to put it on "all mark up"
12 to see it. Can you go up to "simple mark up." Do you
13 see that to the right in track changes? And change it
14 to "all mark up," and then you'll see it.

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: This is a new version. I
16 haven't worked with the new version.

17 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I mean, it's the same
18 language that I sent over, but it's -- instead of
19 "which," you will say "both disadvantaged LEAs and
20 remaining LEAs."

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Now track changes are
22 off.

23 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Once you look at the
24 table, that's what you think we meant. But before you
25 look at it, it's not clear.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. That's good.

2 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And then my only other
3 question, and I don't know that it's linked to any
4 changes, is on page 19. Are community colleges --

5 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Our community college --
6 it's a question for -- the community college person is
7 on the phone. Go ahead.

8 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. So I just did a
9 little bit of math on the 578 projects, of which 123 are
10 completed. And when we look at the estimated annual
11 energy cost savings of 1.4 million for those 123
12 projects, that's about 13 percent, almost 14 percent, of
13 the total projected annual energy savings from the
14 program. So 1.4 compared to 10.3 million, which was a
15 little earlier in our discussion there. So that's quite
16 a bit lower as a percentage of total savings than the 21
17 percent of projects done. Should we be comfortable that
18 we're still on track towards getting the total \$10.3
19 million in savings because these first projects were
20 lower cost, therefore lower savings. Or should we be
21 concerned that we're not going to hit that 10 million
22 because the savings is running behind the trend or
23 behind target? End of question.

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you.

25 MS. BARTRIDGE: Are you on the line?

1 MR. MONTTOYA: I, I am on the line. I'm just
2 trying to digest the question here. So --

3 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Do you want me to
4 repeat the math that I did?

5 MR. MONTTOYA: No. Actually, I was working
6 with the -- our consultant, Mat Sullivan, earlier on --
7 we, we got a tidbit earlier of -- the number and the
8 figures and we're trying to figure out -- I think the
9 savings was considered as a point in time. So the 1.4
10 of the 123 projects was for year four at that point in
11 time and the -- I believe the 455 projects are still in
12 progress. So they could finish up this year or the
13 following year.

14 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

15 MR. MONTTOYA: Yeah.

16 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: No. I, I get --

17 MR. MONTTOYA: But --

18 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- that that 1.4
19 million is going to be a smaller percentage.

20 MR. MONTTOYA: Uh-huh.

21 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I mean, is going to be
22 a portion of the target 10.3.

23 MR. MONTTOYA: Right.

24 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: You know, the number of
25 projects is 21 percent of the total 578 projects. The

1 estimated annual savings from those hundred and 23
2 projects is only about 14 percent of that \$10 million
3 savings. So that means that those projects haven't
4 generated 21 percent of savings. Does that mean that
5 they're just smaller dollar projects? I mean, that's, I
6 think, a question. What percentage of, of the total
7 dollars have been spent on those 123 projects? That may
8 tell us that, oh, you know, only 10 percent of the
9 money's been spent. So we're actually ahead -- ahead of
10 it on a proportional basis. It was --

11 MR. MONTOYA: Yes.

12 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- red flag.

13 MR. SULLIVAN: Would you like me to chime
14 in?

15 MR. MONTOYA: Yeah, could you, Mat?

16 MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. So this is Mat
17 Sullivan with Anderson and McCormick. We're the
18 consultant that's working with the chancellor's office
19 on this.

20 So yeah, I mean, you're exactly right. It's,
21 it's -- you know, you can't just look at numbers of
22 projects and, you know, forecast savings. So there's,
23 you know, a variety of different types of projects that
24 we're doing and a variety of sizes of projects. So
25 it's -- you know, the savings are all over the place.

1 We can -- you know, we can do that analysis if you'd
2 like us to and dig a little deeper into, you know, the
3 savings of the closeout projects versus the savings of
4 the in-progress projects. And some of those in-progress
5 projects are probably closed out by now. This was as of
6 earlier -- or late last year actually. So we probably
7 had more current data on those projects but just, just
8 generally speaking -- and we could get this information
9 for you, too, if you'd like. Generally speaking, our,
10 our original project savings estimate was before the
11 projects were started compared to when they were
12 complete are, are pretty close. We haven't found a
13 situation where --

14 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

15 MR. SULLIVAN: -- we overestimated savings
16 significantly. So --

17 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So this feels -- if I'm
18 to paraphrase, this feels like a normal, sort of,
19 in-progress incremental savings, and until we're closer
20 to, you know, 50, 60, 70 percent of projects done, we
21 shouldn't be too concerned about the trend, and, and
22 we'll get a report next year.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And I just did the math
24 on the, the 17.5 million that was sent is 11 percent of
25 the year four funding that was available just to be --

1 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh. We --

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. So the year -- is
3 a hundred and sixty-one point six million --

4 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh, right. And --

5 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And 17.5 is about 11
6 percent of that. So that -- if that helps --

7 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Oh, yeah.

8 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's lower.

9 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. Great. I
10 actually didn't realize we had that number.

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We do. It's on the
12 prior page. I just found it, too.

13 So that -- it's a good point. But did --
14 Barbara, do you think it needs additional clarification,
15 or are you okay?

16 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It was more of just a
17 big question as to are we on track. I don't know that
18 there's anything that we would say differently other
19 than a statement that, you know, this is just an -- a
20 point in time but I think that's almost obvious. You
21 guys just have -- just, sort of, reinforced for me that
22 we're most likely on track.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. Thank you for
24 those points. We did make one edit.

25 Okay. Other questions about report up to the

1 recommendations section? Any, any points of
2 clarification? Any concerns?

3 Chelina and Heather, I want to give you a chance
4 to weigh in.

5 BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: This is Chelina. I'm
6 okay for now.

7 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Me, too.

8 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I had a question for
9 Dave actually, because I wrote this, and I want to just
10 confirm that it works. On page 23 on the job creation
11 page, these were my -- I, I wrote in the definite -- the
12 e.g.s, definition of direct, indirect in these jobs,
13 because I feel like people don't know what that is
14 unless they're in the workforce world. Do you think
15 those work, or do you think those should be written
16 differently?

17 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I'm fine with it. I --
18 could have put sheet metal instead of electricians.

19 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. That's a bias. I
20 think -- no. I --

21 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah. No. I remember
22 reading -- and no. That's fine with me.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. So you think it
24 generally conveys the correct --

25 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yeah.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Mark, you --

2 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I just thought it was
3 helpful.

4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Great. Yeah. I
5 have spent so much of my life explaining those three
6 categories to people. I figured we should just put
7 it -- put it in the report.

8 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: No. I think that's
9 really right on.

10 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So let's talk about the
11 findings and recommendations if no more questions on the
12 prior part of the report.

13 Jim, was there anything else that you had in the
14 prior --

15 MR. BARTRIDGE: No. Just to say that,
16 again, if you -- if you have any other line edits or
17 things like that, we're going to be going through it.
18 Feel free to send it to Jack or myself or both of us,
19 and we'll make sure it's incorporated.

20 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Copy edits by when,
21 though?

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: Probably no later than
23 Tuesday if that's possible maybe Wednesday.

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. So will you send
25 out something after this meeting just reminding people?

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes.

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Findings and
3 recommendations. This is the section that is the most
4 in our voice as a Board. So you all have seen versions
5 of it that I have been sending, but this is the final
6 version. And I just want to talk through this for a
7 second.

8 So this section is always based on our
9 conversations and meetings and people reaching out to me
10 individually or to the staff individually. We make the
11 point at the beginning of this section as we always do
12 that this Board is the one place where all the agencies,
13 kind of, come together. And that has the, kind of, most
14 broad view of the overall workings of the program
15 especially because we also have the public comment
16 board. And so our findings or recommendations are based
17 on that. Basically, the findings section is intended to
18 be a generally supportive set of comments about the
19 outcomes of the program; the particularly increased
20 geographic participation and the increased participation
21 among disadvantaged schools, which were two big pieces
22 of the year. We called out the job training pieces and
23 we called out -- we call out the Energy Commission. We
24 call out the job -- and the job training pieces here
25 because in some ways, that's been the most -- there's --

1 that's, sort of -- that program has really out performed
2 expectations and that we just generally say this is a
3 good program.

4 We can add more in here if people want. So we
5 can stop on the findings for a second, and then we can
6 get to the recommendations. Any thoughts?

7 And thank you for those of you who have already
8 sent me some edits of the sections that have been
9 incorporated.

10 On the phone, Heather or Chelina, any feelings on
11 the findings section?

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: No. We're all
13 right.

14 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great. In the room?

15 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Good.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Everyone good with this
17 section? Okay.

18 Moving to recommendations, let's go through these
19 one by one. I, actually, have an edit to the first
20 recommendation. So -- which I wrote, so I take full
21 responsibility. The first recommendation, I,
22 essentially, recommend the continuing funding of this
23 program, which would have to be through SB 110, because
24 there's the new vehicle, the new regulation through
25 which the program will be funded. I -- the final

1 sentence here says, "in particular," and we put in
2 numbers. So we can talk about this. But we said, "In
3 particular, we recommend the legislature appropriate at
4 least 175 million per year for a competitive grant for
5 LEAs as detailed in SB 110." This needs to be changed
6 to reflect the fact that SB 110 provides funding to both
7 LEAs and to the community colleges, which it does not
8 say right now. So I guess I'm recommending a change to
9 something like, "appropriate at least 175 million per
10 year," to -- just give me a second to think. To -- you
11 know, under the -- "under the, the program guidelines
12 laid out on the SB 110" or just something that says that
13 we'll basically be putting it under 110. Does that make
14 sense to people? So --

15 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: You're not calling out
16 LEAs --

17 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We're not calling out
18 LEAs or competitive grant program because actually, the
19 community college program is not competitive grant
20 program. So it's -- and either are parts -- it's just
21 both of those things are too specific. So --

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So just consistent
23 with --

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Consistent. Perfect.
25 So "at least 175 million per year under terms consistent

1 with SB 110." People happy with that?

2 You got that, Jim?

3 And just as a reminder to folks, SB 110 does have
4 an allocation of percentages to both LEAs and to
5 community colleges. And I think it's -- I have a little
6 cheat sheet here from Jim. I think it's 88 percent to
7 LEAs and 12 percent to community colleges. So you guys
8 know what we're saying, which would be about 154 million
9 or something like that.

10 Yes, Dave.

11 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Where it says, "at
12 least."

13 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah.

14 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: "We recommend that the
15 legislature appropriate the minimum" instead of "at
16 least."

17 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: A minimum of?

18 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Of 175 million.

19 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can you get that, Jack,
20 "a minimum of." We can copy edit all this stuff up
21 there.

22 Okay. All right. On the first recommendations,
23 that was my one change. Any other changes? Great.

24 The second recommendation is -- and actually, the
25 next one -- well, all of them, the next four -- just, I

1 want to remind folks are not part of 110. That's why we
2 had to make them separate. SB 110 does not fund the
3 ECAA-ED program. They do not fund the workforce stuff.
4 It does not fund either of these two things that we ask
5 for all the time but never get. But we're going to try
6 again -- the inventory or the manual and best practices.
7 So that's why they're called out not as part of that
8 first 175. Is that clear to everybody?

9 So the second recommendation is, essentially, a
10 recommendation to support ECAA-ED. This is a
11 recommendation we made, also last year, just as a
12 reminder for new folks. ECAA-ED was funded in the first
13 year of the Prop 39 program but not after that. But it
14 has consistently been -- you know, it's a revolving
15 fund. People put money back into it. There's a zero
16 percent default rate. It is one of the more fiscally
17 responsible pieces of this program, so we called it out
18 once again as a program and, essentially, made this
19 point that it's revolving and that schools don't
20 default.

21 So the second paragraph here, just so you know
22 why it's in here, SB 110 -- SB 110 essentially -- well,
23 actually this is a question for Jim because this was
24 your point. I just made a point that ECAA-ED is not in
25 SB 110. But here, we're, we're using language that

1 implies that it does. This second -- this second
2 paragraph would be separate from 110, right?

3 MR. BARTRIDGE: So --

4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So right now SB 110 does
5 not provide for any funding for ECCA-ED; is that
6 correct?

7 MR. BASTIDA: It does.

8 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just for the remainder
9 of the funds but not for new funds, correct?

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: Correct. So, so the
11 estimate -- 110 called for 75 million for the school bus
12 program, up to a hundred million for ECCA, of which
13 there was only 39 a week or two ago, and we expect that
14 that number is going to continue to decline up until
15 June 30th.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So -- I'm sorry. So I
17 probably misspoke. So essentially -- this is always
18 confusing, but there's, there's two sections of 110.
19 There's the section that's about remaining funds from
20 the first five years of this program, which is school
21 buses ECCA-ED. There's then the section that's about
22 everything going forward, which is competitive grants
23 with no ECCA-ED called out, right? Is that correct?

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yes. I believe that's
25 correct, yes.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So we're essentially
2 saying we want a minimum of -- maybe we change it to a
3 minimum again. But we're saying we want a minimum of
4 funding for ECCA-ED, and we're also saying in the second
5 paragraph, we don't want that to be competitive grant
6 funding because ECCA-ED doesn't work that way actually.
7 It's not spent competitively in the way that 110 lays
8 out. The Bright Schools Program is spent for schools
9 that need technical assistance. It's not a competitive
10 grant program.

11 So I don't know how to make this clearer or if it
12 is clear. But I would -- we would love some help on
13 this recommendation. Essentially, what we're trying to
14 do here is get some, some support; is make a case for
15 ECCA-ED and make a case for us to a higher level of
16 support.

17 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I have a suggestion.
18 If we simply say, In addition, will -- SB 110 calls for
19 future programs to be run on a competitive basis, then
20 continue with everything else you have there.

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Did you get that?

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: "To run on a" or "to be
23 allocated on a competitive basis."

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, you lost it. There
25 you go.

1 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So with that said, is
2 -- how is it that the Bright Schools Program gets funded
3 if schools that have already been approved for something
4 else and then they're just getting this as additional
5 supplemental funding?

6 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's through ECCA-ED, so
7 it's basically funds from ECCA-ED that get -- right?
8 Isn't this right, people in the room?

9 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: I think I understood it
10 last night, but that was at midnight. So --

11 MR. BUCANEG: Basically, what happens is,
12 basically, the funds that get associated with the
13 ECCA-ED program, a portion of those funds are allowed to
14 be used for our Bright Schools program. So that's the
15 percentage of the overall amount of funds that go to
16 ECCA-ED that get held to the side for our Bright Schools
17 Program. So it's a separate application for ECCA-ED and
18 a separate application for our Bright Schools Program.

19 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: But that separate
20 application is only given to those who have already made
21 it through the ECCA-ED program?

22 MR. BUCANEG: No. They can apply either
23 or -- because they -- even if they applied for Bright
24 Schools, doesn't mean they applied for ECCA-ED or vice
25 versa. They can do it separately. We do encourage

1 everyone that comes in for Bright Schools project to --
2 through Bright Schools for identifying energy savings
3 measures. We advise them to go through our loan
4 programs so they can fund the projects, but sometimes
5 they fund it themselves.

6 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So are you saying that
7 you want the Bright Schools Program to be first come,
8 first served? I mean, that if somebody comes and
9 there's funding, they get -- they get allocated.

10 MR. BUCANEG: Right now the program is a
11 first come --

12 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes. Okay.

13 MR. BUCANEG: -- first served basis. So --

14 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: All right. So that's
15 already.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. And SB 110 has
17 priority order for the competitive program, and if you
18 start applying that, it will just -- it would be
19 disaster. So does that make sense, the way it's
20 written?

21 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah, but I think it,
22 it begs the question, what would be the basis for the
23 allocation, and I think you just want to say something
24 to the effect of maintain the status quo -- first come,
25 first served -- for those meeting the eligibility

1 requirements or something.

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So maybe we change this
3 sentence from a negative. So instead of, "The Citizens
4 Oversight Board does not believe the technical
5 assistance," maybe we should change it to a positive
6 statement. "Believes that technical assistance and
7 energy funds funded by the Bright Schools Program should
8 continue to be allocated on the current -- " I don't
9 know.

10 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. I don't know how
11 one would describe it other than, "first come, first
12 served." So if there's a different term of -- allocated
13 until funds are no longer available. You know, I mean,
14 it's -- on an eligibility basis rather than a
15 competitive basis.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. Should -- so go
17 to "should continue to be."

18 MR. BARTRIDGE: On a first come --

19 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If that's the way --

20 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Is that -- do you think
21 that's an appropriate way to describe it?

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Eligibility basis. So
23 you still have to meet eligibility criteria.

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Can we just say, "on an
25 eligibility basis"? Does that make sense? Is that term

1 okay? So "on an eligibility basis." Yeah. Coma, "as
2 they're intended."

3 Okay. All right. Good. People good with this
4 as --

5 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Where did that hundred
6 million come from because it's per year.

7 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yes. We -- where did
8 the hundred million come from? Remind me.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: The hundred million, what we
10 had initially thought was that the --

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, I know where it came
12 from.

13 MR. BARTRIDGE: Let me go back.

14 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah. No. It was what
15 SB 110 originally allocated for ECCA-ED after the 75
16 school buses.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: Exactly. It said, "up to."

18 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So they, basically,
19 said, "Of the remaining funds, 75 million -- up to
20 75 --" or no. 75 million, for sure, go to school buses,
21 and then up to a hundred million to ECCA-ED?

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: But that was a one-time
23 allocation.

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That was a one-time
25 allocation.

1 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Well, that's right.
2 That's why I was saying the "per year," makes it sound
3 like it's in perpetuity.

4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well, nothing's in
5 perpetuity because everything's an annual appropriation
6 at this point, right? I mean, unless they write new
7 legislation I guess. We can ask Felicia. I mean, it is
8 a loan --

9 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: We could just say, "a
10 hundred million," and end it there.

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just change it. Take
12 out "per year."

13 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah.

14 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Since it's revolving.

15 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Because that's
17 what it was supposed to get any way.

18 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I was like, "Wow. In ten
19 years, you get a million dollars."

20 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: It's only getting --
21 just to remind folks, because the remaining funds -- the
22 good news is that a lot of LEAs have applied for funds.
23 The remaining funds are less than what we thought.
24 Right now I think it's only around 39 million that's
25 going to go to ECCA-ED after the school buses because

1 school buses get priority. So -- and it may be less.

2 MR. BARTRIDGE: And it's likely going to be
3 less because what we heard was that they had a rush on
4 programs and people submitting application. So by the
5 time they go through the final numbers -- we won't know
6 the final number until June 30th I think.

7 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So let's just stick with
8 the hundred million. People are -- thank you. You all
9 good with that?

10 MR. BARTRIDGE: And I'm taking out the "per
11 year."

12 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: "Per year," yep.

13 Okay. Got it.

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: Yeah.

15 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thanks, guys.

16 All right. Number three. Now, there's no number
17 in here. This is Director Works of the
18 pre-apprenticeship program. I just want to remind folks
19 that the pre-apprenticeship program is -- this is the
20 program that people from other states call us about
21 consistently. It is unbelievable what results they're
22 getting. I mean -- and we see them, and we have
23 double-checked them. Their placement rates are
24 unbelievable, and I think that's because they made it a
25 multicraft program not a targeted energy efficiency

1 training program, which was just very innovative, and a
2 lot of states are looking at, at copying it. So that
3 program has been an unfunded mandate from day one.
4 They, essentially, were told to do it with no money
5 from, from the legislature. And they redirected funds,
6 and they have had amazing results. So we've -- I think
7 we have all been really impressed with it. We want to
8 support it. We did not put a dollar amount in here. We
9 can talk about whether we want to put a dollar amount in
10 here. I'm not sure what it would be actually. They ran
11 that program with about \$3 million per year and it's one
12 thing to be -- it was in the report. One thing that's
13 interesting about that is that the California
14 Conversation Corps ran with about 5.7 million per year.
15 So more with less placement, which I think is
16 interesting. So do we want to put a number in here. Do
17 we want to try to have this thing -- I mean, I feel like
18 we should try to fund it, but I don't know what the
19 number should be.

20 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Well, it sounds like you,
21 kind of, do. I mean, you know, you're saying that it's
22 a successful program and ran at 3 million and -- so, you
23 know, it's at least three whether you want to up it or
24 not, but there should be a number in there for sure.

25 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: How do people feel?

1 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: I agree.

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Go ahead, Chelina.

3 BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: I don't have a
4 suggestion in terms of a number, but I'm just
5 questioning is there anything else that you guys think
6 we can put in the recommendation that would raise the
7 level -- kind of urgency or opportunity that this
8 program is showing us. Even if it's something as simple
9 as referring them in this presentation to a particular
10 portion of the report that --

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

12 BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Because I think it
13 will help make this statement really clear. It --
14 there's other really -- that might make someone want
15 to --

16 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: More persuasive.

17 BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Yeah.

18 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: We could put in the
19 placement data, which we'd have to go back. I mean,
20 that would just be putting a pin on that and would have
21 to be okay with us doing that. But we could -- if we
22 want to put in the placement data to be clear on how
23 many people this is, that could be good.

24 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And it could come right
25 after the statement about model for other states. Just

1 insert some of that additional fact buttressing there,
2 and then based on all of that, you know, "we believe it
3 should be funded going forward." If, if --

4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

5 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If we make a statement
6 that we think reasonable starting point for the
7 administrative funding is \$5 million but obviously defer
8 to the legislative -- you know, the budget and
9 legislative process to fine tune it, at least we're
10 putting something out there that has -- you now, or
11 maybe it's \$4 million because we're rounding up from
12 three and a half or whatever that number is.

13 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: In that scenario,
14 who would receive the money? Would it be the Energy
15 Commission, and then it's granted to these entities?

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: No. It would be the
17 reverse donor board specifically. Yeah. They are
18 who -- this was never money that came from the CEC.
19 This was always money that they converted from other
20 programs, essentially, to meet the goals of Prop 39. So
21 it would have to be -- I mean, like, some of these
22 sections, it would be -- it would need -- this would
23 need to be, kind of, an amendment from the legislature
24 or a new bill from the legislature. So -- or just a new
25 allocation to the --

1 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Clarification question.

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah.

3 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It implies that that
4 work will continue regardless of what else is happening
5 to say we're asking for that administrative support. So
6 under what circumstance would this unfunded mandate end
7 versus which of the program recommendations that we're
8 making would cause us to continue to need the workforce
9 development program. How --

10 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well, it's ending anyway
11 at the end of the five years of the original Prop 39
12 program because the directive from the legislature from
13 that first program was to essentially train -- with the
14 workforce development program -- to train people for
15 these jobs. That's how they decided to do it. That
16 mandate no longer exists. It's not in SB 110. So there
17 is no longer any requirements for them to keep doing
18 that training. They will probably end it because it's
19 an unfunded program. So what are the conditions. I
20 guess the conditions are; if we no longer did any energy
21 efficiency in schools, if there's never any more money
22 allocated after the remaining funds were spent to any of
23 these programs at all, then, theoretically, we wouldn't
24 need workers.

25 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: So we probably need to

1 make that connect-the-dots observation that if --

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well --

3 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- the legislature
4 continues the Energy Efficiency Program, we're assuming
5 that additional workforce training is going to continue
6 to be needed on an ongoing basis, and as long as these
7 other programs are funded, they should be funded and
8 should run the training program.

9 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I'm actually going to
10 take back what I just said because, because this is a
11 multicraft program. It's actually applicable to every
12 single program that the State runs that's on clean
13 energy or efficiency.

14 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay.

15 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So there's actually --
16 it's hard to think of a situation in which we wouldn't
17 need that especially given that we have AB 32 and all
18 this funding going into these --

19 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

20 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: -- projects. This is
21 probably the most effective program for all of those.

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Okay. So maybe we need
23 to --

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So --

25 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- and that gets back

1 to buttressing the argument for continuing this
2 program --

3 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yeah.

4 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- a little bit more
5 because it's not linked just to the Prop 39 program.

6 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yep.

7 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: But we have been in a
8 unique position to be able to watch the effectiveness of
9 the program. Okay.

10 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That's a good point. So
11 we will work with approval on the original motion here.
12 We'll work on language to strengthen this recommendation
13 and make both the points about additional positive
14 benefits from the program as it exists and also to make
15 the point that this training is applicable across all
16 the states so that clean energy and climate goals will
17 also -- if people are comfortable with us adding a five
18 million a year number to this, we will do that. Are
19 people comfortable with that number? Yeah?

20 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yeah. They're either
21 going to take that advice or not.

22 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well, that's generally
23 true. Right. In this whole thing. All we can do is
24 try. That is -- that's the thing about money. Exactly.
25 It is -- it's unusual, I will just say, to see a really

1 effective drought training program. It's really hard to
2 do. So that's partly why it's an interesting example
3 because it's -- most of them don't work. So --

4 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: If I could make an
5 observation, I just went to a board meeting of the
6 California Clean Energy Fund last Friday at the San
7 Leandro Energy Efficiency through a Net Zero Energy
8 Training Center that they have done with others, and
9 it's pretty amazing. And they definitely take the
10 multicraft, you know, example to heart. Even within the
11 electricians, they're really looking at, you know, the
12 entirety of what might be needed not just for
13 installation of solar or not just for installation of
14 the energy efficiency, and it's pretty amazing.

15 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I completely agree. I
16 recommend people go to that facility if you haven't.
17 It's amazing.

18 All right.

19 MR. BARTRIDGE: Just a point of
20 clarification.

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Sure. Go ahead.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: On the five million funding,
23 is that per year or is --

24 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yep

25 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. Thank you.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Why not. No. Just
2 kidding. Yes.

3 All right. Number four. This is a
4 recommendation we have had before, but it has a little
5 bit of color. We normally recommend this. One of the
6 things that's been true since the beginning of this
7 entire program is there's never been a State inventory
8 of school facilities ever, which meant that it's always
9 been extraordinarily hard to target these funds. And we
10 have recommended for the past two years, I think, that
11 there be an inventory. This year, we added a sentence
12 about the fact that the Energy Commission is collecting
13 utility data from every one of the schools. The LEAs
14 that have done a project through Prop 39, we have 12 to
15 18 months of utility data. We also have all of the
16 California Conservation Corps audit data, which we've
17 got a presentation on when they were here. So all of
18 that -- those data are not going anywhere and being used
19 for anything at this moment unless there's some decision
20 to do that. So that's what this recommendation is.
21 Again, it doesn't have a dollar amount connected to it.
22 I don't have any idea what that would cost. We may want
23 to recommend -- make the recommended addition more
24 advisory that, that there be a -- you know, multi-agency
25 discussion about using the data. I don't know how we

1 want to do it. But right now it's essentially just a
2 recommendation on how the information be leveraged. Do
3 we want to make it stronger? Do people have other
4 comments about this recommendation?

5 Yes, Mark.

6 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. So this is a topic
7 that's, sort of, near and dear to me. So we have a
8 researcher at UCLA who runs this -- who runs the, the
9 center on sustainable communities. And they have
10 created something called the Energy Atlas. And in the
11 Energy Atlas, it literally has parcel scale energies
12 data on -- as well as building age and a number of other
13 different factors on -- and that's -- right now it's for
14 all of LA County. I think they're expanding it right
15 now to all of southern California on -- user areas. So
16 that's -- you know, compilation-wise, that's pretty much
17 half the state on. And so there's a fair amount of this
18 plus what you're saying from -- now people submitting
19 data separately. That could be there. The fact that
20 this has just been done in a way without using the best
21 available data, to me, is stunning, but it is what it
22 is. But it seems like since the program's evolving, you
23 know, from the standpoint of it's not operating same way
24 it did in the first five years obviously with the
25 legislation from last year on, it just makes sense that

1 this is an opportunity to make sure it's a more targeted
2 program so that the dollars that are used, you know, are
3 targeting on, you know, schools and disadvantaged
4 communities on -- that are the most energy efficiency --
5 inefficient on -- and so we get the most bang for the
6 buck with what will clearly be a much more limited pool
7 of dollars. And so it seems like there's a much
8 stronger rationale in which to utilize this approach
9 when before it was obviously a bigger dollar amount
10 on -- and so on -- that's, that's what I'd like to see
11 this do, but I don't think it really does.

12 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Can I ask a question of
13 Mark?

14 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.

15 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Do you think what we
16 need to do is just make an encouraging statement that
17 these agencies search out others who are undertaking,
18 sort of, big data projects that could leverage this
19 because we don't know what would -- at this point,
20 probably what is the most efficient? But, you know, you
21 have just given us one example. Do, do we want to
22 include that example?

23 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Um, I, I -- you know, I, I
24 didn't really say that to pretty much say, "Hey, you
25 know, let's have it go to my university on," you know.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I mean, we could just
2 add, after public school facilities, just in addition,
3 you know, "relevant data is available at universities
4 and utilities across the state."

5 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yes.

6 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: "Seek out some
7 partnerships that would leverage this data with, with
8 other," you know, "research institutions, government
9 agencies, et cetera."

10 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: But I think -- I think the
11 stronger thing is to add the point that, you know, we
12 really want to target continuing resources towards those
13 schools in disadvantaged communities that had the
14 greatest need, which would be those with the most
15 inefficient, older structures based on the data.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I have -- I have a
17 question on that, but first, it sounds like Heather or
18 Chelina wants to weigh in here. So go ahead.

19 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: I was just
20 agreeing.

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Chelina. I'm sorry?

22 BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Nothing from me.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Here's a question to
24 what you just said Mark because I think that's
25 absolutely right. The question is, under SB 110, can --

1 the way SB 110 is written, the competitive grant program
2 only is by geography and then it's disadvantage. It's
3 not disadvantage from a facility standpoint. It's from
4 what they often use, which is free and reduced lunch.

5 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: There's a lot of
6 alignment there.

7 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: There, there is
8 alignment but they're also -- they're not looking at
9 prioritizing the facility need, right. So I'm just --
10 I'm really asking the question is can you -- can we ask
11 for priority here when it's not part of 110? Do you
12 know what I mean?

13 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I, I don't see how that's
14 any different than asking for money that we don't know
15 is there. I mean, we're basically saying this is our
16 best professional judgement, and we'd like to do it in
17 this way, and so I don't really see the difference.

18 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So I don't -- we should
19 not try wordsmith-ing this right here, but what we're
20 essentially getting at is we want to add, essentially,
21 to make clear that we would -- we believe the funding
22 going forward should be targeting for those schools in
23 disadvantaged communities with the greatest facility
24 need, essentially, from an equity standpoint.

25 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That is something that
2 requires data and we, we are recommending that -- who
3 are we recommending do this actually is a good question.
4 What entity would you, kind of -- I mean, I feel like it
5 should be the California Department of Education because
6 they are the people with the databases by facility right
7 now. They're the only people who have databases by --
8 they, they determine free and reduced lunch status.
9 They're the only people who have databases of all the
10 schools. So it feels like it should be them, but that
11 may not be a smart recommendation. I don't know.

12 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I mean, I think -- I think
13 what Barbara was saying was it, it could be in, you
14 know, collaboration with, you know, the UC and CSU
15 system or academic institution.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right.

17 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Because the reality is
18 they're going to have some data and, and academics are
19 going to have different data --

20 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And utilities --

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Well, I just meant -- I
22 just meant which coordinating agency.

23 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I
24 misunderstood.

25 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: No problem.

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: Should it be a function of
2 the Energy Commission in Collaboration with Department
3 of Education and CCC working with others? I don't know
4 that, you know, they can potentially workshop it. We
5 could work with Commissioner McAllister and think
6 through some of the things that he's approaching on the
7 energy efficiency side and try and marry something
8 together.

9 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right.

10 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: It, it sounds like we
11 might get more leverage if the CEC were an active
12 participant because of the --

13 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Uh-huh.

14 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- higher level of
15 motivation in energy efficiency, where CEC has a lot of
16 their responsibilities.

17 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yep.

18 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: And I would also note that
19 CEC knows very well about the Energy Atlas effort as
20 well.

21 MR. BARTRIDGE: And we have a disadvantaged
22 community advisory group as well.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right.

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: So there's a lot of synergy.

25 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah.

1 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: And the POC as well.

2 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right, because they
3 have data.

4 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Right. So, so, so, A,
5 there's the language on, on the need to better target.
6 But B, it sounds like what we're -- actual
7 recommendation is --

8 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Collaborative.

9 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Is a collaborative
10 effort, yeah.

11 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: -- be undertaken
12 probably led by CEC.

13 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Collaborative effort
14 with a goal of what to recommend.

15 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. I think that
16 makes sense. I have notes here, Jim. So essentially,
17 again, making that case about better targeting; making
18 the case that we need this collaborative effort; and
19 making the case that that would include reaching out to,
20 to universities and utilities and any other entity that
21 has, you know, done data collection on these, these
22 issues. I know that Berkeley Center for Cities and
23 Schools has done some, too, but there's a bunch of
24 different places, none of which right now have a -- have

25 a coordinated -- a coordinated system. I do want to

1 include the Department of Education just because I think
2 they need to be part of this. They're -- they really
3 are the people who do the most outreach to schools and
4 maintain a list and a database. So --

5 All right. Are folks comfortable with that --
6 those additions? We will work through them, but
7 generally, those additions to this recommendation?
8 We'll do a motion on all this. It's going to be a
9 complicated motion. So --

10 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I'm almost done.

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, Mark's almost
12 leaving us. He's leaving us in nine minutes. Can we
13 make it through.

14 MR. BARTRIDGE: And there's no funding
15 associated with that one.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

17 MR. BARTRIDGE: It's just, "Go figure it
18 out. Make something of it."

19 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: I don't think we have
20 any idea what it would cost or what that would look
21 like. You know, and I just want to -- we do make this
22 recommendation every year. It has, so far, not worked,
23 but we can keep trying. The final one is a
24 recommendation that's actually just copied and pasted
25 from last year. So it's just our, our recommendation

1 that we learned a lot in the first five years of the
2 program. We should write it down. Somebody should
3 write it down and, and make -- and we, we actually say,
4 "a third party organization" to basically look at all
5 this and write down what's worked and what hasn't worked
6 because other, other states are interested and other,
7 other parts of this state, California, are interested.
8 So it's that again. We did not recommend -- we just
9 said, "allocate some funding." We didn't actually
10 recommend an amount. We can. We need to take out -- I
11 should change this. We need to take out "possibly out
12 of unspent program funds," because those have been
13 allocated through SB 110. So now they have. So take
14 out that parenthetical. Do we want to put a number in
15 here? Do you see where I'm talking about, Jim? I don't
16 have any clue what the number would be either. It's
17 like a grant to somebody to basically evaluate the
18 program and figure out what's worked and what hasn't
19 worked. I don't know that we want to put a number in,
20 but we could. It's not that much. It's, it's, it's
21 like a hundred thousand dollars or something.

22 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Right.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Do we want to put that
24 in? Do we want to set some funding, or do we want to
25 put in a number?

1 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I just don't think a
2 hundred is the right number.

3 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Just give us a number,
4 Mark, and we can discuss it.

5 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: I would have given you a
6 number on the last one, too, but it doesn't matter. I
7 don't know. "Not to exceed 250."

8 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. You guys good
9 with that? How about allocate -- take out "some."
10 "Allocate funding."

11 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: And then put, "e.g."
12 not, not actually a cap but something like, "examples."

13 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Uh-huh.

14 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: To -- maybe not like a
15 maximum but we're, sort of, saying ballpark. Yes.

16 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: So e.g. 250,000.

17 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: That's fine.

18 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Does that work for
19 everybody?

20 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yeah. I just think a
21 hundred -- you guys have so much data and so many
22 examples, a hundred grand -- a hundred K won't do it.

23 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Okay. Okay. Otherwise,
24 people generally happy with this one?

25 All right. Look at that. Are there

1 recommendations -- oh, Chelina and Heather, I'm sorry.
2 Your moment to speak.

3 You're good. Okay. Are there things we have
4 left out that people feel a burning need to include?

5 Randall.

6 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Just a thought as I
7 look at the appendices, as we list them, considering
8 this after four years, standalone document, we might
9 consider adding the original legislation that created
10 this.

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: That's a good idea.
12 That's very smart.

13 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: You may as well add the
14 110, too.

15 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Add 110, also. Yeah, we
16 should add 110 also. Great point. There's actually two
17 pieces of original legislation, right? There's the Cork
18 Bill and the -- I can't even remember. The De Leon Bill
19 and the Cork Bill; is that right? 73 and then the other
20 one, right? And then there's -- and now there's 110.
21 Thank you. It would be good for all of us to go back
22 and read them, too, because sometimes, we forget.

23 Anything else, from Board members? I know we're
24 about to lose Board Member Gold, so I want to do a
25 motion on this. This is going to be a motion --

1 essentially, this is going to be a motion to accept the
2 report with all copy edits recommended by staff or Board
3 members and the specific amendments that were made
4 during the course of this meeting either to the document
5 or through discussion.

6 Do we have a motion?

7 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: So move.

8 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, Dave. I'm going to
9 go with Dave.

10 BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Second.

11 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, I'm going to go with
12 Chelina seconding because Barbara's already gotten a
13 second one. So, you know, everyone gets a chance.

14 All right. Let's do a rollcall on this, because
15 it's important.

16 MR. BARTRIDGE: Okay. We're going to --
17 we're going to start with our outside parties today.

18 So Heather Rosenberg.

19 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Sorry. What was
20 that?

21 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Vote on the motion.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: Vote on the motion.

23 BOARD MEMBER ROSENBERG: Yes. Sorry.

24 MR. BARTRIDGE: Chelina Odbert.

25 BOARD MEMBER ODBERT: Yes.

1 MR. BARTRIDGE: Randall Martinez.

2 BOARD MEMBER MARTINEZ: Yes.

3 MR. BARTRIDGE: Barbara Lloyd.

4 BOARD MEMBER LLOYD: Yes.

5 MR. BARTRIDGE: David Dias.

6 BOARD MEMBER DIAS: Yes.

7 MR. BARTRIDGE: Mark Gold.

8 VICE-CHAIR GOLD: Yes.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: Chair Gordon.

10 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Yes.

11 Yay. All right. Thank you, everybody. That was
12 relatively painless. I, I appreciate that.

13 We now have -- I, I don't know that we have any
14 public on the phone or in the room, but we have the
15 opportunity for public comment on any of the items on
16 the agenda before we close.

17 Is there anyone waiting to make a comment?

18 Any of the CEC staff feel like making a comment?

19 UNIDENTIFIED MAN ON PHONE: I think we're
20 good.

21 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Great.

22 MR. BARTRIDGE: One, one more reminder
23 before you close, and I, I don't know yet, but form 700s
24 due by April 2nd, 2018. If you haven't submitted
25 already, please send them to Jack, and we'll get them

1 processed and submitted.

2 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you for the
3 reminder. I, too, need to do my form 700. And one more
4 reminder, the next -- I will be reaching out to several
5 of you individually to talk about the audit. And we may
6 put together a -- not a committee -- but we may have
7 some conversations, with no more than two Board members
8 at any time, about the audit as we're getting there.

9 Thank you, Mark.

10 Because, again, we are in -- we are auditing
11 right now. We're going to get the draft audit in May.

12 Am I correct about that, Jack?

13 MR. BASTIDA: July -- June.

14 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Oh, June. Okay. So we
15 will have -- our next meeting will be a review of the
16 draft audit. And we will have to start thinking through
17 some decisions about the next set of audits because
18 we're -- the audit's going to start becoming more
19 complicated soon. So let's -- I want to put a pin on
20 that, Barbara. I will certainly reach out to you as our
21 official financial experience person on the Board. Help
22 with audit process and that is really important. It is
23 one of our main functions. We also have some
24 outstanding points from the last audit that we need to
25 follow up on. So this is going to be -- now that this

1 is over, we're going to have a bunch of audit
2 conversations coming up. So be prepared.

3 Other than that, thank you to everybody so much
4 for all your participation, for coming up, and for
5 helping with this last-minute push on this report. If
6 it makes anyone feel better, I wrote the whole
7 recommendation section on my birthday, which was Monday.
8 So that's what I did.

9 MR. BARTRIDGE: Happy birthday.

10 CHAIRWOMAN GORDON: Thank you. It's all
11 about dedication to the State from all of us.

12 All right. Thanks, everybody. Meeting's closed.

13

14 (Whereupon the proceeding concluded at 2:58 p.m.)

15

16

17

--o0o--

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 I, Brittany Flores, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of
2 the State of California, duly authorized to administer
3 oaths, do hereby certify:

4 That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me
5 at the time and place herein set forth; that any
6 witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to
7 testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the
8 proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which
9 was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the
10 foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony
11 given.

12 I further certify I am neither financially interested
13 in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney
14 of party to this action.

15 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my
16 name.

17
18 Dated:

19
20 _____
21 Brittany Flores CSR 13460
22
23
24
25